



# Labour market status, transitions and gender: a European perspective

Mathilde Guergoat-Larivière, Christine Erhel

## ► To cite this version:

Mathilde Guergoat-Larivière, Christine Erhel. Labour market status, transitions and gender: a European perspective. 2010. halshs-00484577

**HAL Id: halshs-00484577**

**<https://shs.hal.science/halshs-00484577>**

Preprint submitted on 18 May 2010

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

# **Labour market status, transitions and gender: a European perspective**

**Christine Erhel (CEE, Université Paris 1, Centre d'Economie de la Sorbonne)**

**Mathilde Guergoat-Larivière (Université Paris 1, Centre d'Economie de la Sorbonne, et CEE)**

## **Summary**

This article analyses the determinants of labour market statuses (choice between part time employment, full time employment, and non employment) and yearly transitions between non employment and employment in Europe, using cross sectional 2006 EU-SILC database. The results show a strong positive effect of initial education level on full time employment integration and on the probability to find a job when initially in non employment. Gender and family variables also exert a strong influence on labour market statuses and mobility: being a woman, and even more a mother of a young child, increases the probability to be in non employment, or in part time employment, and also to experience a bad transition. In terms of policies, the article shows that the use of childcare has a positive impact on parents' employment and transitions. Finally, the heterogeneity inside the EU appears high, with significant country effects on both statuses and flows.

## **Résumé**

L'article analyse les choix d'activité (emploi à temps plein, emploi à temps partiel, non emploi) et les transitions (non emploi-emploi) sur le marché du travail en Europe, à partir de l'enquête européenne EU-SILC (base transversale 2006), disponible pour 27 pays. Il se fonde sur une perspective croisant analyses de flux du marché du travail, marchés transitionnels et perspective de genre, présentée dans une première section. Sur la base de statistiques descriptives puis de régressions logistiques, l'article montre l'effet des facteurs individuels sur les choix d'activité et la qualité des transitions, ainsi que le rôle des modèles nationaux. Outre les caractéristiques individuelles usuelles (âge, sexe, nationalité, niveau d'éducation), l'analyse inclut des variables concernant la situation familiale (vie en couple, présence de jeunes enfants) et le recours aux modes de garde. Pour l'ensemble de l'Union Européenne, les résultats attestent l'effet favorable du niveau d'éducation sur l'insertion dans l'emploi à temps plein et le maintien en emploi (ou la probabilité de retrouver un emploi à partir du non emploi). Etre une femme, a fortiori avec un enfant de trois ans ou moins, augmente la probabilité d'être en non emploi, ou à temps partiel, et celle de connaître une transition défavorable, tandis que les pères de jeunes enfants sont au contraire plus intégrés dans l'emploi. Pour les parents, le recours à la garde d'enfant joue favorablement sur l'insertion dans l'emploi et les transitions. Enfin, les différenciations internes à l'Union Européenne apparaissent fortes, le pays de résidence constituant un déterminant significatif de la situation sur le marché du travail et des transitions.

**Key words:** labour market status, labour market flows, European comparison, childcare

Over the last ten years, the developments of the European Employment Strategy and of the Lisbon Strategy have promoted both a gender perspective on European labour markets (with the goal of 60% female employment rate in 2010 and several indicators of gender equality<sup>1</sup>), and a dynamic perspective focusing on transitions and careers, that appears through secondary indicators of the EES (such as transitions from non employment towards employment, or upward wage mobility, etc.<sup>2</sup>), but also in the “flexicurity” guideline and the various reports on this issue since 2005 (European Expert Group on Flexicurity, 2007).

Nevertheless, despite these recommendations, policy goals and indicators, empirical evidence combining gender, labour market status and transitions perspective remains relatively limited for the EU 27. This article tries to fill this gap, using recent comparative data from EU-SILC survey. The goal of the empirical analysis is to provide some insights concerning the individual determinants of labour market situation and transitions in the EU in order to give some empirical foundations to potential European policy recommendations. In a gender equality perspective, which is consistent with the current EES guidelines, the effects of family situation and childcare should be assessed. Besides, given the differences in labour market institutions and policies inside the EU, the issue of inter country heterogeneity and the role played by national models should be taken into account.

## **1. Labour market status and transitions: how does gender matter?**

Recent European labour market policy orientations can be related to several analytical backgrounds that are combined in the present article.

First, dynamic approaches of the labour market based on the analysis of jobs and workers flows have become more and more widespread in economic literature. Indeed, some empirical evidence showed that traditional approaches in terms of stocks may induce a truncated vision of labour market functioning and thus gave a rationale for a more dynamic approach of labour market phenomena. From a theoretical point of view, these analyses are mainly based on matching models (Pissarides, 1990; Mortensen and Pissarides, 1994) in which labour market equilibriums are seen as “flow equilibriums”, depending on firms’ hire-fire decisions. Such

---

<sup>1</sup> The Laeken indicators of job quality that belong to the EES monitoring process include various gender gap indicators (employment rate gap, unemployment rate gap, pay gap). They are published every year by the European Commission in the Compendium for monitoring the Employment Guidelines.

<sup>2</sup> These indicators also belong to the Laeken list.

models are used to figure out how institutions influence job creations and destructions, and thus global labour market performances, and generally conclude in favour of “flexicurity” principles, i.e. combinations of low job protection and labour market policy security like in the Danish model (Brown and Snower, 2009). From an empirical point of view, two main perspectives are adopted alternatively in the literature on job and worker flows (Davis *et al.*, 2006): one is centred on firms’ behaviour and based on firm-level data while the other focuses on workers’ mobility and rather uses individual longitudinal data to point out hires and fires or transitions between employment, unemployment and inactivity. In recent research concentrating on these issues, it appears that individuals characteristics such as age, gender and education level influence greatly transitions: youth, women and low qualified are on average more mobile on the labour market but women and low-qualified are particularly worse-off since they have a lower probability to experience a “good” transition (i.e. towards employment) (European Commission, 2009). Indeed, “good transitions” tend to be concentrated on some privileged groups (men, high qualified etc.) whereas risks of experiencing outflows from employment towards non employment and potential durable exclusion are mainly borne by women, seniors, low qualified people, immigrants etc. In this perspective, it is then essential to better know the determinants of transitions and to figure out which social groups are the most at risk in terms of mobility.

Second this article also refers to various analyses that focus on workers’ choices and more generally on activity choices of working age population, notably women, relying either on socio-economic perspective (life course perspective) or on more standard labour supply models.

Research relating women’s labour supply to economic, institutional or cultural features is considerable. Some papers dealing with women’s labour market integration use a dynamic perspective but they generally focus on a specific angle of labour market conditions such as the number of hours worked (Kalmijn *et al.* 2005) or wages (Sigle-Rushton, Waldfogel, 2007, Meurs *et al.*, 2008) etc. This dynamic perspective seems particularly appropriate since labour market patterns of women are much more chaotic than men’s along the life cycle. However, proper transitional variables are barely used in the literature in a comparative perspective. The paper by Dex *et al.* (1996) is one of the rare to use directly transitions variables in order to understand the determinants of mothers’ transitions between employment and non-employment before and after childbirth in three European countries.

Some other analyses on women's employment behaviour are based on non-linear models that use as dependent variable the employment status of women (Kenjoh, 2005, Chaupain-Guillot *et al.*, 2007). These studies can thus compare the behaviour of mothers and non-mothers, according to a given number of family characteristics and institutions.

Comparative research in this field shows clearly that the extent of labour market integration patterns varies considerably across countries, with strong differentiations by age and gender. Besides, family formation and young children have a strong gender-differentiated impact on labour market participation and working time patterns, with large differences across countries. European comparisons in this field show that very different "models" of labour market integration still coexist in Europe (Anxo *et al.*, 2007). In particular, women's working patterns across life course vary widely according to their marital status, the number of children, the age of children etc. but also according to their country. Numerous studies show that having children impacts negatively on women's labour supply but that this impact greatly differs across countries. For example Anxo *et al.* (2007) show how employment rates and hours worked are combined and how much they vary according to the type of household (age of adults, number and age of children etc.) in seven different European countries. Working time flexibility is the main adjustment variable in the Nordic countries, with a majority of mothers staying in employment, whereas in Southern countries women tend to leave the labour market when they get married or have a child.

Considering this overall negative impact of children on women's employment and the disparities observed in cross-national comparisons, research often try to link these differences to the various public policies for women's employment and childcare. In particular, most of studies analyse the impact of having children on women's labour supply by focusing on how family characteristics and institutions interact and some particularly search to compare the efficiency of different kinds of public policies (Jaumotte, 2003, De Henau *et al.*, 2010).

The occurrence and reversibility of transitions are indeed much depending on policy institutions such as childcare structures, fiscal policies, working-time arrangements etc. These policies can play in favour or against women's participation on the labour market (Jaumotte, 2003, Bothfeld, O'Reilly, 2002) and are likely to influence considerably women's "strategy" on the labour market. While some institutional contexts would lead to pure and simple exit of women from the labour market, some others favour either "entry-exit" strategies along the life cycle or "reconciliation" strategies, between family and professional responsibilities (Moschion, 2007).

Finally, this article also draws on the Transitional Labour Market perspective that has been developed since the end of 1990s and has built one of the theoretical influences of the EES (Schmid, Gazier, 2002; Muffels, 2008). This perspective is particularly interesting since it offers a broad analytical framework, including an analysis of choices and of transitions both on the labour market and within employment. It also insists on the recent development of “intermediate” states between some well-identified positions (employment, unemployment, inactivity), such as part-time work, training, parental leave etc. Furthermore, it emphasizes the role played by national institutions and policies in structuring these transitions patterns. But the TLM perspective also takes a normative point of view, and sustains that the renewal of the European Social Model should be based on principles such as empowering the individuals and providing them with a capacity of choice and a capacity to reverse these choices. In this perspective good transitions are defined according to criteria of reversibility of choices, and not only according to short term satisfaction. This is especially important for women who are more concerned by career discontinuities and part time jobs that may affect their employment and earnings prospects. Indeed, the “transitional” approach focuses notably on gender issues since women and men experience very different kinds of trajectories across their life cycle (Anxo *et al.*, 2008). This approach is then of particular interest when one concentrates on women’s integration on the labour market as they are on average more concerned by multiple transitions: in particular childbirth and childcare cause interruptions in most of women careers.

In this article, we aim at combining an analysis of labour market integration choices, including family and childcare variables, with some insights on labour market mobility, and especially on the transitions between unemployment, inactivity and employment. Both types of analyses will include a gender perspective, but the analysis is not limited to women so that it is possible to propose a comparison of the impact of children and of childcare structures on men and women’s labour supply.

As we have seen before, studies that analyse women’s labour supply either concentrate on one specific country on the basis of national data or try to consider several countries using different national databases or harmonised data. Our article follows this last option and it is among the firsts, to our knowledge, to make a comparison for the enlarged European Union. Using the EU-SILC database, harmonised data are available for 2006 for 24 countries of the EU. This allows on one hand to check if well-known outlines about women’s labour supply

are confirmed at the level of enlarged EU and on the other hand to get a more detailed picture of European differences in terms of gender differentiation on the labour market. Including a large number of countries characterised by very different labour market functioning (OECD, 2006; Amable, 2005; Davoine *et al.*, 2008), this analysis brings some new elements to compare the different European models in terms of transitions. In particular, it allows comparing usual typologies based on employment and unemployment performance to the new picture that emerges considering transitions.

This article is structured as followed. The second part of the article is devoted to the description of the database, definition issues and methodology. In a third section we present some statistics about labour market situations and transitions between these situations. The fourth section analyses the influence of individual variables –including marital status, the presence of children under three and the use of childcare- on labour market status and yearly transitions between them.

## **2. A comparative European database**

### **2.1 The EU-SILC survey (Survey on Income and Living Conditions)**

EU-SILC is an instrument aiming at collecting multidimensional micro data on income poverty and social exclusion at the household level. It also contains information about individuals' labour market situation and health. The EU-SILC database divides into cross sectional data and longitudinal data: cross-sectional data pertain to a given time period with variables on income, poverty, labour market position, social exclusion and other living conditions, whereas longitudinal data enable to follow up individuals over time, observed periodically over, typically, a four years period.

EU-SILC was launched in 2004 in 13 member states (+Norway and Iceland) and extended in 2005 to the rest of the EU. The first release of the cross sectional data refers to income reference year 2003 and covers only Luxembourg, Greece, Portugal, and Denmark. For the year 2004 the survey includes 13 member states and Norway. It has reached its full scale extension in 2005 with the 25 EU countries plus Norway and Iceland, and should be completed later by Turkey, Romania, Bulgaria and Switzerland. Therefore for most countries both types of data (cross sectional and longitudinal) are now available for 2005 and 2006.

In EU-SILC individual labour market status can be approached through two variables: the basic activity status, that offers a distinction between employment, unemployment and inactivity, and a self defined economic status differentiating between part time and full time employment, as well as between different types of inactivity<sup>3</sup>. Given the importance of part time work in a gender oriented perspective, we use both variables.

In these databases labour market mobility and transitions between labour markets statuses can be identified in two ways. First, the cross section survey includes a question about the most recent change in activity status, indicating if there has been a modification in individuals' situation since the last interview (or in the last 12 months for the first interrogation). In case of several changes, the latest is taken into account. A typology of transitions is proposed in the questionnaire, corresponding to all possible changes between four statuses, unemployment, employment, retirement, and other inactivity. Second, in the longitudinal database, annual transitions can be derived from basic variables about labour market status (employment, unemployment, inactivity) or more detailed information about the self declared economic status that allows for distinctions between part time and full time. The longitudinal database is thus useful to get a precise decomposition of transitions, but a number of interesting variables that can be seen as potential determinants of labour market transitions are not included in these data. This is the case of the nationality variable<sup>4</sup>, but also of all information about children and the use of childcare that is only contained in the cross section data. Given the focus of this article, dealing with the relationships between gender and labour market situations, such variables are crucial and therefore our econometric analysis is based on the declared transitions and on the cross section database. The counterpart of that choice is that we cannot study transitions within employment (between part time and full time, or temporary and permanent contracts), as we did in another study using the panel dimension (Erhel, Guergoat-Larivière, 2009; Begg *et al*, 2010). Besides, given the limited availability of the self declared transition variable for some countries in 2006, the sample of countries is reduced to 16 in this part of empirical analysis.

In the cross section database we dispose of the main individual socio-economic indicators, such as gender, age, level of education according to ISCED classification (level 0 to 6, as proposed by UNESCO)<sup>5</sup>. Other variables like the marital status (living in couple or not) and health status (self declared chronic illness) will also be included in the analysis. Children and

---

<sup>3</sup> Details about the variables are provided in appendix 1.

<sup>4</sup> Country of birth, with three categories: national, other EU countries, outside the EU.

<sup>5</sup> The corresponding categories are detailed in appendix 1. In EU-SILC data categories 5 and 6 are merged.



childcare variables have been constructed by matching children (and related childcare) with their parents. In EU-SILC, childcare is divided in several categories (see appendix 1 for details): in the present article we use a formal childcare variable, corresponding to the use of any type of childcare service (pre-school, day-care centre, professional child-minder at child's home or at child-minder's home) for children aged 0 to 3.

## **2.2 Methodological issues**

As in the existing literature (European Commission, 2004, 2009; OECD, 2009a; Burda, Wyplosz, 1994) we account for transitions between the three main labour market statuses, employment, unemployment and inactivity. The descriptive analysis is based on transition matrices, expressing the number of transitions from a given status to another as a percentage of individuals in the initial situation. In order to identify the role played by some socio-economic variables in the structure of individual transitions, these matrices have been calculated by gender, by age group, and for parents of young children (aged fewer than 3, with a distinction between mothers and fathers). They are also decomposed by country in order to get a first view of heterogeneity across European countries. These descriptive results are analysed in section 3. In that section we also present standard descriptive statistics concerning the distribution of full time/part time employment and non employment (unemployment and inactivity), focusing on gender issues.

A further step is to distinguish between these different effects and to obtain results that can be interpreted “other things being equal”. For that purpose we run two types of logistic regressions: first binomial logits to explore the relationship between socio-economic variables and transitions between non employment and employment, second multinomial logits to account for the choices between part time, full time employment and non employment. Independent variables are the same in all the regressions.

In these econometric analyses we consider individuals aged 15 to 65. Each independent variable that includes more than two modalities is replaced by as many dummies as there are modalities. We also choose a reference category for each variable:

- For age, the intermediary age class (25-54);
- For nationality, being born in the country of current residence;
- For education level, low education level (corresponding to ISCED 0 and 1 that have been regrouped).

For purely dichotomous variables, references are the following: male, living in couple, not suffering from any chronic illness, without a child aged 0 to 3.

We control for country heterogeneity through the introduction of country fixed effects. We discuss the coefficients obtained for these country dummies in the perspective of a European comparison of labour market transitions. As they are among the most populated countries in the EU, we take either Germany or France as the reference country, depending on data availability<sup>6</sup>.

An interaction term is also introduced in some regressions to differentiate between the effects of some determinants according to gender. For instance, we can assume that having young children is likely to impact differently men and women's labour market situation (Angrist and Evans, 1998). When this interaction term is introduced, it should measure the variation of transition probability that is predicted following a concomitant variation of the two variables (for instance gender and children 3 or less).

Considering two interacted dummy variables  $x_1$  and  $x_2$  and a vector  $X$  of additional independent variables, the conditional mean of the dependent variable can be written as follows (Ai, Norton, 2004):

$$E(y | x_1, x_2, X) = \frac{1}{1 + e^{-(\beta_1 x_1 + \beta_2 x_2 + \beta_{12} x_1 x_2 + X\beta)}} = F(u)$$

With  $u = \beta_1 x_1 + \beta_2 x_2 + \beta_{12} x_1 x_2 + X\beta$  and  $F$  the logistic function

The interaction effect between  $x_1$  and  $x_2$  is then the cross-partial derivative of the expected value of  $y$ :

$$\frac{\partial^2 F(u)}{\partial x_1 \partial x_2} = \beta_{12} F'(u) + (\beta_1 + \beta_{12} x_2)(\beta_2 + \beta_{12} x_1) F''(u)$$

---

<sup>6</sup> Transition variables are not available for Germany.

### **3. Transitions, life course and national models**

Both employment statuses and transitions are considered in this research.

We present first the results of some comparative transitions analysis, and then some comparative data of employment rates for the whole population aged 15 to 64, for women and for mothers with kids aged less than 4.

#### **3.1 Transitions heterogeneity across the EU**

The EU-SILC database also allows monitoring labour market dynamics through the transitions of individuals across different types of employment status (employed, unemployed, and inactive). Such transitions might be identified either through individual's declarations on their most recent change of activity status (in both the longitudinal and the cross sectional databases), or using their (yearly) declared main activity status in the longitudinal database. We computed both types of data, but we use here the declarative variable, since our econometric analysis is based on cross section databases for 2005 and 2006.

Transitions rates are calculated as shares relative to individuals' previous labour market status, which imply that they are not comparable across different initial statuses. Given the definition of the variable in the EU-SILC survey, the time scope is not necessarily homogeneous: individuals are asked whether there was a change in the individual activity in the last 12 months, but if there was more than one change in the individual activity status the most recent change should be recorded (Eurostat, 2008). Labour market mobility tends therefore to be underestimated in the survey, and the transition rate reflects the share of people having experienced at least one transition of this type over the last 12 months.

Given these limitations, in the descriptive statistics, we concentrate on transitions' structure rather than interpreting the probabilities to make a given transition, using 3-by-3 matrices. Some empirical evidence is presented on labour market transitions at both the aggregate level and a number of breakdowns, such as by gender, age, and presence of children. In the present section, the analysis remains descriptive and comments on some first intuitions to be explored concerning the sources of heterogeneity in labour market transitions.

The results show a clear differentiation of transitions rates by gender. Overall transitions rates (table 1) from unemployment or inactivity to employment are lower for women than for men. Symmetrically the probability to transit towards inactivity (out of employment or

unemployment) is higher for women than for men, indicating a reinforced risk of labour market exclusion. These gender differences concern both young (15-24) and prime age (25-54) groups, but appear more limited for seniors<sup>7</sup>. Besides, as shown by table 2, this gender gap increases for parents of young children (aged 0 to 3): the unemployment-employment transition rate decreases for mothers and increases for fathers, which appears consistent with other results concerning labour market statuses over the life course. According to Anxo *et al* (2007), men's employment rates and hours worked tend to increase with a child birth, whereas the reverse trend is observed for mothers. Besides, in our data, transitions rates towards inactivity are notably higher for mothers than for the general female population, even if their transitions rates out of inactivity (especially towards employment) also stand at a higher level (but far behind men's). This could reflect the impact of parental leaves that are still concentrated on women. Nevertheless, transitions of mothers using childcare facilities are far more favourable than the average, and their rates of outflow from unemployment towards employment are close to fathers'. On the whole the transitions' perspective confirms that women tend to be disadvantaged on the labour market, especially mothers, and point out that childcare is a key factor in the reduction of mobility gender differential for parents of young children.

Age also plays a role in these transition matrices. Older workers (55-64) tend to have considerably lower favourable transition rates than other age groups: the proportion of seniors declaring a transition from unemployment towards employment over the last 12 months amounts to 15%. Youth (15-24) experience higher transition rates than the general population, whatever their initial situation. Their unemployment-employment transitions rate is higher, but they are also more likely to lose their job and flow out of employment. Besides, they make fewer transitions from inactivity to employment than prime age workers, which may be due to more of the age group being in education.

These results concerning the relationships between demographic variables and transitions are consistent with other studies using different databases (OECD, 2009a; European Commission, 2009). The main originality of EU-SILC database is that it includes some information about family and the existence of childcare facilities, as in the European Community Household Panel.

---

<sup>7</sup> Some tables crossing age and gender are available on request.

**Table 1- Transition matrices between labour market statuses, by gender (15-64, 2006, in %)**

Initial situation \ Status in 2006	Total			Men			Women		
	<i>E</i>	<i>U</i>	<i>I</i>	<i>E</i>	<i>U</i>	<i>I</i>	<i>E</i>	<i>U</i>	<i>I</i>
<i>E</i>	92,3	4,3	3,4	93,7	3,8	2,6	90,5	5,1	4,4
<i>U</i>	37,9	53,3	8,7	41,5	51,8	6,7	34,6	54,8	10,6
<i>I</i>	3,4	1,0	95,7	3,6	1,2	95,2	3,1	0,8	96,0

Source : EU-SILC, cross section data base, authors' computation

E : Employment ; U : Unemployment ; I : Inactivity

Note: Among women coming from unemployment, 34,6% found a job and became employed in 2006

**Table 2- Transition matrices of parents (children aged 0 to 3) by gender (2006, in %)**

Initial situation \ Status in 2006	Fathers			Mothers			Mothers using childcare		
	<i>E</i>	<i>U</i>	<i>I</i>	<i>E</i>	<i>U</i>	<i>I</i>	<i>E</i>	<i>U</i>	<i>I</i>
<i>E</i>	96,4	2,9	0,7	82,4	6,7	10,9	89,9	6,6	3,6
<i>U</i>	57,3	40,3	2,4	31,9	50,1	18,0	52,0	39,2	8,8
<i>I</i>	31,7	2,7	65,7	10,9	1,8	87,3	16,7	1,4	81,8

Source : EU-SILC, cross section data base, authors' computation

E : Employment ; U : Unemployment ; I : Inactivity

Note: Among mothers coming from unemployment, 31,9% found a job and became employed in 2006

**Table 3- Transition matrices between labour market statuses, by age (2006, in %)**

Initial situation \ Status in 2006	15-24			25-54			55-64		
	<i>E</i>	<i>U</i>	<i>I</i>	<i>E</i>	<i>U</i>	<i>I</i>	<i>E</i>	<i>U</i>	<i>I</i>
<i>E</i>	81,3	11,9	6,8	94,4	3,8	1,8	87,8	3,1	9,1
<i>U</i>	46,1	44,6	9,3	39,7	53,5	6,8	15,6	69,1	15,3
<i>I</i>	7,2	2,7	90,1	9,3	2,4	88,3	1,6	0,3	98,2

Source : EU-SILC, cross section data base, authors' computation


E : Employment ; U : Unemployment ; I : Inactivity

Note: Among youth coming from unemployment, 46,1% found a job and became employed in 2006

In a comparative perspective, transition matrices also show important differences between countries. Focusing on transitions from unemployment towards employment (figure 1) transitions rates range from less than 30% in Belgium, Slovenia, Italy, and Czech Republic, to more 45% in UK, Spain, Austria, Lithuania and Estonia. The transition rate from inactivity to


employment also varies between 3% or less in France, Belgium, Slovenia, or Spain, and over 5% in Estonia, the Netherlands, Austria, Lithuania and the UK (figure 2). Moreover, the extent of the gender gap varies substantially across countries, especially for the transition from unemployment to employment<sup>8</sup>. Women tend to be disadvantaged in Spain, Portugal, Slovakia, whereas their situation appears more favourable in the Netherlands, Austria, Lithuania, and Estonia. The role of inactivity and the transitions from and towards this situation also differ across countries. The gender gap appears rather large in Poland, Lithuania, Latvia, Czech Republic and Slovakia, where women have higher probabilities to leave employment towards inactivity. Of course such comparisons have to be considered with care: first, the transitions rates are likely to be unstable from one year to another, so that the relative positions of countries may vary, and second in depth comparisons have to include stocks to take into account the relative position of women on the labour market.

**Figure 1- Transitions out of unemployment, 2006 (in %)**



<sup>8</sup> The figures for women are available on request.

**Figure 2- Transitions out of inactivity, 2006 (in %)**



NB: Given the importance of the number of individuals staying in inactivity, to increase the visibility of the figure the minimum of the scale has been set at the level of 84%

### 3.2 The differentiated women's and mother's employment rates

Our database confirms quite well known characteristics of women's and mothers' employment rates across the EU (table 4). On average (for 26 countries), female employment rate is lower than for the whole population in the age group 15 to 64 (56% against 63%). And for mothers of young children (aged 0 to 3) the difference is bigger, with an employment rate of 53%. Inside employment, they are more likely to work part time: in our sample, part time employment rate amounts to 18,5% for women, and 23,9% for mothers of young children, in comparison to 11,8% for the whole population. The gender and maternity effects appear thus very strong in the European Union.

Nevertheless, this overview hides substantial differences between countries. In Southern countries (Spain, Greece, Italy), as well as in some Eastern European countries (Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland), women's employment rates stand below the European average. On the contrary, Nordic countries (Denmark, Iceland, Norway, and Sweden) but also the UK exhibit high female employment rates (over 60%). From that point of view, Baltic States (Estonia, Lithuania, and Latvia) are close to this group. Finally, an intermediate group includes continental countries such as Austria, France, Germany, but also the Netherlands,

Slovenia and Slovakia: these countries are close to the average, with a few of them just reaching the EES target of 60%. The frequency of part time differs widely across Europe: almost 43% of Dutch women are working part time, against less than 5% in almost all new member states. Apart from the Netherlands, part time employment also stands at a high level in Germany (33%), in the UK (25%), as well as in Ireland, Luxembourg, and Sweden (over 20%).

For mothers of young children, country heterogeneity is even more striking. In some countries a majority of them are non employed: more than 80% of mothers do not work in the Czech Republic and in Hungary, 76% in Austria, 67% in Estonia, 59% in Finland, 56% in Germany. These countries correspond to the first cluster identified by Chaupain-Guillot *et al* (2008) on the basis of ECHP data and of some policy variables concerning childcare, parental leave and family allowances. In their results (which are limited to the EU 15 due to the data source they use), Austria, Finland, France and Germany build a group characterised by a long parental leave, resulting in lower employment rates for mothers of young children than for other women (or even mothers of older children). According to our results that are more limited because here we use only employment rates<sup>9</sup>, this high mothers' employment gap group should be enlarged to some Eastern European countries and could be explained by the presence of long parental leave (OECD, 2009b). Contrary to this, in Nordic countries (Sweden, Denmark, Norway), but also in Portugal and the Netherlands, more than 70% of mothers of young children are in employment.

In countries where part time is developed (in the EU average or above), mothers' part time employment rates tend to be higher than for women in general. This is especially true in the Netherlands, where 64% of mothers of young children are working part time, in Germany and the UK (36%), in Belgium (28%), or in France (25%).

These descriptive statistics suggest that women's and even more mothers' labour supply behaviour differ according to national models, which include a whole set of policies and institutions that are heterogeneous across Europe. This was clear from previous work on the EU 15 (Chaupain-Guillot *et al*, 2008, Kenjoh, 2005), but is reinforced in the enlarged Union.

---

<sup>9</sup> This explains why France is not in this group. France was included in this cluster because of the generosity of family allowances.



**Table 4– Employment rates (full time, part time) and non employment rates, women and mothers of young children (15 to 64) in 2006<sup>10</sup>**

	Women			Mothers kids aged 0 to 3		
	Full time employment	Part time employment	Non-employment	Full time employment	Part time employment	Non-employment
<b>EU average</b>	38,4	18,5	43,1	30,1	24,0	45,9
<b>AT</b>	36,8	19,0	44,1	9,0	14,2	76,8
<b>BE</b>	32,6	22,6	44,8	43,6	28,9	27,5
<b>CY</b>	51,6	6,3	42,2	65,2	4,9	29,9
<b>CZ</b>	49,7	3,9	46,5	11,0	3,8	85,2
<b>DE</b>	27,7	33,8	38,5	6,8	36,4	56,8
<b>DK</b>	47,6	16,2	36,2	51,8	18,6	29,6
<b>EE</b>	60,3	4,9	34,8	28,1	4,7	67,2
<b>ES</b>	39,5	11,2	49,3	39,1	15,3	45,6
<b>FI</b>	53,2	10,8	36,0	32,7	7,5	59,8
<b>FR</b>	41,8	18,1	40,0	38,3	25,4	36,3
<b>GR</b>	39,3	8,0	52,7	40,3	9,6	50,0
<b>HU</b>	48,0	4,4	47,6	17,3	2,5	80,1
<b>IE</b>	32,8	21,7	45,5	31,8	21,2	47,0
<b>IS</b>	51,4	18,3	30,3	45,3	21,9	32,8
<b>IT</b>	36,4	9,7	53,9	35,6	17,0	47,4
<b>LT</b>	58,0	3,6	38,4	57,6	0,9	41,4
<b>LU</b>	33,4	22,0	44,6	33,4	35,5	31,0
<b>LV</b>	59,0	4,9	36,0	37,4	6,5	56,1
<b>NL</b>	16,9	42,9	40,2	8,1	64,4	27,6
<b>NO</b>	52,1	16,8	31,1	54,0	22,1	23,9
<b>PL</b>	42,8	5,4	51,9	40,6	7,5	51,8
<b>PT</b>	53,6	7,6	38,8	74,9	6,0	19,1
<b>SE</b>	48,1	23,8	28,1	48,8	28,0	23,2
<b>SI</b>	52,0	2,0	45,9	75,0	4,3	20,7
<b>SK</b>	54,5	3,5	42,0	58,7	2,6	38,7
<b>UK</b>	40,1	25,3	34,7	17,2	36,0	46,8


Source : EU-SILC, cross section data base, authors' computation  
Figures in % of the population in the age group

In our database, the only variables that capture some components of this institutional diversity are those concerning the use of childcare. The rate of mothers using formal childcare arrangements for children aged 0 to 3 varies greatly in the sample, from 11% in Poland to 74% in Denmark. On the whole it confirms that childcare is well developed in the Nordic countries, but also in the Netherlands, and to a lesser extent in France and UK. Among the Southern countries, Portugal and Spain are the most concerned by the use of childcare for young children. The situation in Eastern countries seems rather specific, with very low rates except for Slovenia. Informal arrangements (grand-parents etc.) might build a partial

<sup>10</sup> The meaning of countries abbreviations can be found in appendix 1.

compensation for this deficiency in childcare policies, but this situation may hinder the integration of women and mothers on the labour market.

**Figure 3- Childcare services use**



Source: EU-SILC, 2006 cross section data base, authors' computation

#### **4. Determinants of labour market situations and transitions in Europe**

These descriptive statistics show how employment and transitions patterns differ in Europe according to age, gender, parental status but also across countries. This first picture needs to be confirmed by some additional analysis in order to assess the specific role of each determinant “other things being equal”<sup>11</sup>. As the EU-SILC database contains some information on family statuses, children and childcare, it is possible to test how these factors influence the labour supply and the transitions of individuals. From a gender perspective, a special emphasize is made on differentiation between men and women’s behaviour and trajectories.

As mentioned before, the cross-sectional database does not contain transitions’ variables that distinguish between some detailed activity statuses (part-time, full-time etc.) whereas this database is the only one containing some information on children, childcare etc. Given these limitations the analysis proceeds in two steps.

In the first step (section 4.1), binomial logit regressions are run to assess the impact of various determinants on the probability to move between two given states: employment and non-employment. Non-employment aggregates unemployment and inactivity. These two states could not be considered separately because of sample size problems when studying transitions from unemployment. Two series of regressions are run in this first part: on one hand considering people who are employed at first; on the second hand considering individuals who are in non-employment at first. In each case, the dependent variable is a dummy variable that takes one if the individual makes a “good” transition namely a transition to employment. This allows an easier interpretation of coefficients: for each independent variable, a positive coefficient means that the variable has a positive (numerical) impact on transition to employment and thus a literally positive (“normative”) impact. The value added of this first step comes from the use of transition variables as dependent variables that leads to a better account of labour market dynamics especially considering career discontinuities experienced by women.

---

<sup>11</sup> Regressions have also been run on 2005 data that confirm the general results of the analysis on 2006 presented here.

In a second step (section 4.2), we model the probability of being either non-employed or employed distinguishing between full time work and part time work for those being employed. This partition in three states as well as the analysis through a multinomial logit model follows the lines of other studies on women's employment (Chaupain-Guillot *et al.*, 2008, Kenjoh, 2005). It seems crucial to assess the impact of the different variables considered here on the choice between part time and full time work. Indeed, it is well-known that part-time work is viewed in many European countries as a way of conciliating work and family life. However, women's employment as well as the use of part-time work may greatly differ in Europe according to the family policies implemented and particularly the availability of childcare structures. In this second step, the reference state is non-employment and coefficients thus indicate the impact of each independent variable on the probability to be either in part-time work or in full-time work compared to the probability of being non-employed.

In the first as well as in the second step of the analysis, different models are tested. All of them include main socio-economic variables namely gender, age, education level, marital life, health status and nationality. In each series of regressions, four models are presented: the first one includes a variable on the presence of young children (aged three or less); the second one tests the hypothesis of a different effect of young children on women and men through the inclusion of an interaction term between young children and gender. The two following models (numbered [3] and [4]) are run on a smaller sample that only contains parents of children aged three or less in order to test the impact of childcare use on labour market status and transitions of parents. In model [3], a variable on the use of childcare structure is introduced and in model [4] we test the hypothesis of a differentiated effect of childcare on mothers' and fathers' labour market status and transition patterns by introducing an interaction term between childcare and gender.

In every model, country dummies are introduced to control for heterogeneous effects across the European Union. Coefficients for these dummies are presented in appendix 2 and discussed at the end of this section. The interpretation of these effects is not straight forward as they can be related to some very diverse aspects of countries (macroeconomic shocks, institutions, cultural features...). However, the introduction of variables on childcare allows distinguishing the specific effect of family policies on labour supply of individuals.

#### 4.1 Transitions between employment and non-employment and the impact of family variables

The first model confirms the impact of the main socio-economic determinants on transitions' quality. Some specific groups appear particularly disadvantaged in terms of mobility among which women but also youth, seniors (aged 55 or more) and people suffering from a chronic illness. They are all less likely both to stay in employment when they are employed and to move to employment when they are non-employed (see table 8 in appendix 2 for transitions from non-employment). Citizens from outside the EU are also less likely to stay in employment compared to national citizens, whereas no effect is observable for citizens from another EU country. The latter are even more likely to move to employment when they are non-employed compared to national citizens.

**Table 5- Transitions from employment<sup>12</sup>**

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4	
Parameter	Estimate	Pr > ChiSq	Estimate	Pr > ChiSq	Estimate	Pr > ChiSq	Estimate	Pr > ChiSq
Intercept	2.1786	<.0001	2.0483	<.0001	1.8072	<.0001	1.9700	<.0001
educlevel2	0.0538	0.2013	0.0601	0.1540	0.2419	0.1060	0.2539	0.0907
educlevel3	0.3400	<.0001	0.3538	<.0001	0.8103	<.0001	0.8142	<.0001
educlevel4	0.5545	<.0001	0.5723	<.0001	0.8899	<.0001	0.9147	<.0001
educlevel5	0.7886	<.0001	0.8272	<.0001	1.2241	<.0001	1.2304	<.0001
woman	-0.5224	<.0001	-0.3334	<.0001	-2.1508	<.0001	-2.4215	<.0001
ag15_24	-1.2029	<.0001	-1.1705	<.0001	-0.5107	<.0001	-0.5164	<.0001
ag55_64	-0.9062	<.0001	-0.8909	<.0001	0.0265	0.9796	0.0842	0.9348
couple	0.4172	<.0001	0.4311	<.0001	0.2431	0.4549	0.2597	0.4268
illness	-0.4573	<.0001	-0.4692	<.0001	-0.0957	0.3499	-0.0989	0.3373
eu	-0.1507	0.0675	-0.1512	0.0687	-0.3413	0.1161	-0.3277	0.1297
oth	-0.3003	<.0001	-0.3178	<.0001	-0.6100	<.0001	-0.6229	<.0001
kid3	-0.7632	<.0001	0.1260	0.0399			0.1619	0.2180
woman*kid3			-1.5412	<.0001				
childcare					1.0099	<.0001		
woman*childcare							1.1665	<.0001
Country dummies	Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes	
Number of observations	130307		130307		13645		13645	

Source : EU-SILC, 2006 cross section data base, authors' computation

<sup>12</sup> Comments refer to results on transitions from employment but also to the results on transitions from non employment that can be found in table 8 in appendix 2.

The level of initial education has a clear-cut effect on the probability to make good transitions: the more educated the more likely to stay in employment or to move from non-employment to employment. However for individuals who attained a level 2 of initial education, their probability to stay in employment is not significantly different than those of people who attained a level 0 or 1 (who are taken as reference) and they are even less likely to move from non-employment to employment.

Living in a couple has a positive and highly significant effect on the probability to make a good transition, either to stay in employment or to move from non-employment to employment. It can be assumed that this variable is a proxy for diverse unobservable variables that are positively correlated with having a job.

From a gender perspective, it is remarkable that having children aged three or less lowers the probability of individuals to stay in employment. However, there is no effect on the transition from non-employment.

These first regressions are then complemented with another two (models 2 in table 5 and in table 8) that include an interaction term between the variable on children and the gender variable. This allows distinguishing possible differentiated effects of young children on women's and men's transitions. Indeed, the introduction of the interaction variable between woman and young children leads to an interesting result: the coefficient for children aged three or less becomes positive<sup>13</sup> while the coefficient for the interaction term is negative and highly significant. This result supports the hypothesis that the negative impact of children on transitions is concentrated on women. Women having young children are more likely to move out of employment and less likely to move out of non-employment. The positive sign related to the children variable when the interaction term is included confirms that this effect is rather reverse for men: having young children implies a higher probability to stay in employment or to move to employment when non-employed. This differentiated effect can be related to the traditional roles played by women and men with children (especially young children): the "breadwinner model" is still observable in the EU. As mentioned in section 3, this result is consistent with some other studies on the European Community Household Panel for 2000-2001 showing that households with children are characterized by higher employment rates and longer working time for men whereas women from these households experience lower

---

<sup>13</sup> In the regression from employment, this effect is positive and significative at 5% level.

employment rates and fewer hours of work compared to couples without children (Anxo *et al.*, 2007).

In models [3] and [4], the sample is restricted to parents of children aged three or less to study the impact of childcare facilities on transitions of men and women. This restriction of course causes a huge drop in the number of observations but these complementary regressions display interesting results: the use of childcare services has a positive and highly significant impact on transitions to employment (coming from employment or non-employment). The effect of marital life is not significant anymore when the sample is reduced to people with children aged three or less as these individuals mainly live in couple. Models [4] test the hypothesis of a different effect of childcare on women's and men's transitions. It appears that the impact of childcare use is not significant anymore when an interaction term between this variable and gender is introduced, whereas the coefficient related to the interaction is positive and significant. The use of childcare services clearly impacts positively women's transitions but does not seem to have any effect on men's transitions. This shows once more that the care of children is mainly supported by women so that they gain more from the availability of childcare structures in terms of transitions to employment.

#### **4.2 The choice between full time or part time employment and non employment**

In order to have a wider view on activity choices of individuals in Europe from a gender perspective, multinomial logit regressions are run to assess the impact of different variables – especially family and family policy variables – on the labour supply of men and women. In this part, three possible states are taken into account: non-employment, part-time work and full-time work.

The simplest model (model [1] in table 6) confirms some features already observed in the first part of the econometric analysis: initial education prevents from non-employment; youth, seniors, people suffering from chronic illness and citizens from outside the EU are less likely to be employed either full-time or part-time. The distinction between part time and full time employment in this regression highlights the specific situation of women in terms of hours worked: they are more likely than men to be employed part-time and less likely than men to be employed full-time compared to be non-employed. As in previous regressions on transitions, the presence of young children has a negative impact on employment (both part-time and full-time).

**Table 6- The determinants of activity choices**

		Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4	
Parameter	Employment status	Estimate	<i>Pr &gt; ChiSq</i>	Estimate	<i>Pr &gt; ChiSq</i>	Estimate	<i>Pr &gt; ChiSq</i>	Estimate	<i>Pr &gt; ChiSq</i>
Intercept	PT	-0.6120	<.0001	-0.6245	<.0001	-1.4107	<.0001	-1.1520	<.0001
Intercept	FT	0.8731	<.0001	0.7564	<.0001	0.1975	0.0779	0.3665	0.0012
educlevel2	PT	0.000994	0.9732	0.00344	0.9076	0.2234	0.0738	0.2331	0.0634
educlevel2	FT	0.1272	<.0001	0.1339	<.0001	0.4718	<.0001	0.4804	<.0001
educlevel3	PT	0.5278	<.0001	0.5333	<.0001	0.8008	<.0001	0.8171	<.0001
educlevel3	FT	0.8254	<.0001	0.8405	<.0001	1.2307	<.0001	1.2386	<.0001
educlevel4	PT	0.7424	<.0001	0.7511	<.0001	1.0491	<.0001	1.0761	<.0001
educlevel4	FT	1.2338	<.0001	1.2597	<.0001	1.4536	<.0001	1.4721	<.0001
educlevel5	PT	0.9074	<.0001	0.9189	<.0001	1.2506	<.0001	1.2732	<.0001
educlevel5	FT	1.5794	<.0001	1.6208	<.0001	2.0355	<.0001	2.0443	<.0001
woman	PT	0.7514	<.0001	0.7825	<.0001	-0.1498	0.0363	-0.4824	<.0001
woman	FT	-1.1777	<.0001	-1.0182	<.0001	-3.3230	<.0001	-3.5655	<.0001
ag15_24	PT	-1.4689	<.0001	-1.4721	<.0001	-0.5494	<.0001	-0.5534	<.0001
ag15_24	FT	-1.9442	<.0001	-1.9175	<.0001	-0.7210	<.0001	-0.7335	<.0001
ag55_64	PT	-1.1748	<.0001	-1.1818	<.0001	-0.7960	0.1572	-0.6798	0.2222
ag55_64	FT	-1.7017	<.0001	-1.6771	<.0001	-1.8172	<.0001	-1.6999	<.0001
couple	PT	0.4564	<.0001	0.4573	<.0001	-0.1099	0.5391	-0.1082	0.5479
couple	FT	0.5218	<.0001	0.5176	<.0001	0.0498	0.7609	0.0539	0.7412
illness	PT	-0.4954	<.0001	-0.5002	<.0001	-0.3443	<.0001	-0.3548	<.0001
illness	FT	-0.8697	<.0001	-0.8809	<.0001	-0.5877	<.0001	-0.5925	<.0001
eu	PT	-0.00371	0.9470	-0.0054	0.9228	-0.2337	0.1381	-0.2312	0.1448
eu	FT	0.0986	0.0107	0.0919	0.0187	-0.1658	0.1977	-0.1611	0.2123
oth	PT	-0.1435	0.0009	-0.1424	0.0010	-0.8491	<.0001	-0.8643	<.0001
oth	FT	-0.2503	<.0001	-0.2636	<.0001	-0.9296	<.0001	-0.9412	<.0001
kid3	PT	-0.3172	<.0001	0.2145	0.0007				
kid3	FT	-0.5846	<.0001	0.7086	<.0001				
woman*kid3	PT			-0.8056	<.0001				
woman*kid3	FT			-2.0871	<.0001				
childcare	PT					1.2880	<.0001	0.2361	0.0749
childcare	FT					1.2091	<.0001	0.4000	<.0001
woman* childcare	PT							1.2369	<.0001
woman* childcare	FT							1.0420	<.0001
Country dummies		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes	
Number of observations		291650		291650		25615		25615	

Source : EU-SILC, 2006 cross section data base, authors' computation. PT: part-time / FT: full-time



The second regression shows that behind the global negative effect of children on employment, women's employment remains much more affected by the presence of children. Indeed, the interaction term between gender and young children is negative and highly significant for both part-time and full-time compared to non-employment whereas coefficients for children become positive in this regression. This confirms that the negative impact of children is concentrated on women whereas men are more likely to work than to be non-employed when they have young children.

Models [3] and [4] focus on the impact of childcare on activity status considering only parents of young children (aged three or less). They reveal that the use of childcare structures encourages employment, since people using childcare are more likely to be employed full-time or part-time rather than non-employed. However, the number of hours of childcare is not considered here and it can be assumed that distinguishing between different ranges of hours would lead to more precise results and particularly it may lead to a different impact on part-time and full-time employment.

The introduction of an interaction term in the model [4] shows that the positive impact of childcare on employment is wider for women but that childcare also increases the probability of working full-time for men compared to be non-employed. This positive impact of childcare on fathers' employment shows that among fathers of young children, those who use childcare structures are more likely to work full-time than to be non-employed compared to fathers who do not use childcare structures. From a policy perspective, it could be interpreted as a positive impact of childcare on fathers' employment. However, this result should be taken with care since no income variable is included in regressions and there may be correlations between the use of childcare and income (especially in countries where childcare is expensive).

Whatever the perspective that is adopted on individuals' labour market situations (current status or flows) the results display the importance of initial education level as well as the role of family variables. Gender inequalities appear clearly from the whole population as well as for parents of young children, with a corrective impact of childcare that tends to promote women's employment. The results then suggest two main policy orientations to enhance labour market integration and the reversibility of transitions, namely the increase in initial education levels, and the development of childcare policies.

### 4.3 Country heterogeneity

In all the models presented, country dummies are generally significant, confirming the hypothesis of cross country heterogeneity in the determinants of labour market statuses and transitions.

In the sample that is used to assess the impact of individual variables on transitions, France is used as a reference. Given the persistence of non employment in the French context<sup>14</sup>, country dummies all have a positive sign, indicating a positive impact of living in other EU countries on the probability to stay in employment. The coefficients associated with these effects are the highest in the Netherlands, Portugal and UK, and the lowest in Spain and Austria. Considering transitions from non employment, living in some countries seems to reduce the probability to move to employment compared to France: dummies are negative and significant for Italy, Belgium, the Czech Republic and Slovenia. In the absence of Nordic countries in this sample, these results are consistent with other studies displaying the differences in national transitions rates: some countries, especially the Nordic countries and the UK seem to favour good transitions, whereas mobility generally appears less favourable in continental and southern countries (European Commission, 2009)<sup>15</sup>.

---

<sup>14</sup> Which already appears in descriptive statistics, and might correspond to the high share of long term unemployment in the French labour market, and to difficult reintegration after an inactivity spell.

<sup>15</sup> Our results using the longitudinal database also confirm these comparative results (Erhel, Guergoat-Larivière, 2009). Nevertheless, comparisons based on transitions variables should be treated with care, as the results are quite sensitive to the period of observation

**Table 7- Country fixed effects in model 1 of each regression (from employment and from non employment)**

	Model 1			Model 2		
	Estimate	Standard Error	Pr > ChiSq	Estimate	Standard Error	Pr > ChiSq
Intercept	2.1786	0.0449	<.0001	-1.1981	0.0444	<.0001
educlevel2	0.0538	0.0421	0.2013	-0.1997	0.0412	<.0001
educlevel3	0.3400	0.0370	<.0001	0.4796	0.0357	<.0001
educlevel4	0.5545	0.0606	<.0001	0.8508	0.0592	<.0001
educlevel5	0.7886	0.0420	<.0001	1.0677	0.0414	<.0001
woman	-0.5224	0.0221	<.0001	-0.6614	0.0226	<.0001
ag15_24	-1.2029	0.0331	<.0001	-0.6929	0.0301	<.0001
ag55_64	-0.9062	0.0295	<.0001	-2.0572	0.0404	<.0001
couple	0.4172	0.0261	<.0001	0.1794	0.0286	<.0001
illness	-0.4573	0.0261	<.0001	-0.6755	0.0288	<.0001
eu	-0.1507	0.0824	0.0675	0.2456	0.0769	0.0014
oth	-0.3003	0.0552	<.0001	0.1272	0.0536	0.0176
kid3	-0.7632	0.0350	<.0001	-0.00003	0.0391	0.9994
AT	0.2852	0.0513	<.0001	0.1190	0.0560	0.0338
BE	0.7818	0.0672	<.0001	-0.5415	0.0653	<.0001
CY	0.7986	0.0710	<.0001	0.4107	0.0541	<.0001
CZ	0.6394	0.0562	<.0001	-0.1071	0.0589	0.0693
EE	0.3979	0.0515	<.0001	0.4829	0.0487	<.0001
ES	0.2919	0.0392	<.0001	0.1068	0.0394	0.0067
IT	0.7558	0.0390	<.0001	-0.3916	0.0372	<.0001
LT	0.4269	0.0642	<.0001	0.1800	0.0575	0.0017
LU	0.7859	0.0797	<.0001	-0.0489	0.0742	0.5095
LV	0.5645	0.0632	<.0001	0.0967	0.0665	0.1458
NL	1.2104	0.0785	<.0001	0.3079	0.0667	<.0001
PT	1.1282	0.0715	<.0001	0.1842	0.0638	0.0039
SI	0.5312	0.0653	<.0001	-0.4656	0.0730	<.0001
SK	0.7211	0.0606	<.0001	0.0975	0.0509	0.0554
UK	0.8117	0.0515	<.0001	-0.0178	0.0559	0.7504
Observations	130307			85007		

Concerning gender, the last multinomial regression presented in table 6 (model [4]) brings interesting results concerning the relationships between national contexts and women's employment<sup>16</sup>. The reference country in this regression is Germany, in which part time stands at a relatively high level (see section 3). It shows that living in the New Member states, as well as in Austria, Spain, Finland, and Greece, has a negative impact on the probability to be on part time work (in comparison to non employment). On the contrary country dummies are not significant for Belgium, France, Luxembourg, Denmark, Norway, Iceland, Ireland, UK,

<sup>16</sup> Table 9 in appendix 2 presents dummies coefficients.

Italy and Portugal, showing that they are close to the German case. The only two countries that increase the probability to work part time are the Netherlands and Sweden<sup>17</sup>. Most country dummies coefficients for full time employment (versus non employment) are positive, with the exceptions of Austria, UK, Czech Republic and Hungary, meaning that living in all other countries increases the probability to work full time. The cross country differences in the incidence of part time for women that appear using descriptive statistics (see section 3) are confirmed when controlling for the impact of the main individual determinants of labour market statuses.

## Conclusion

Analyzing the determinants of labour market statuses and mobility in the European Union leads to some interesting results for the implementation of employment policies. First it underlines the crucial role of the initial education level in labour market position, which appears consistent with the Lisbon Strategy and the goals to rise the percentage of upper secondary education and to reduce the number of school drop outs. Second, in a gender perspective it confirms the negative impact of being a woman and especially a mother on the probability to be in employment, or to experience a good transition. But the empirical analysis also puts forward the positive impact of childcare on women's relative situation, and therefore on gender equality, which corresponds again to the content of the Lisbon Strategy and the EES. More generally the approach in terms of individual transitions globally confirms the determinants of the choices between full time/part time employment or non employment, and thus the characteristics of the most fragile people on the labour market, namely low educated, older people (but also youth), women, foreigners: for all these groups, the management of mobility should be a priority for labour market policies, in order to avoid irreversibility. Our comparative database also brings results concerning the heterogeneity of labour market regimes in the EU, especially concerning women's situation, but also the transitions' perspective. They confirm the good performances of the Nordic countries but a high degree of heterogeneity across the EU 27.

---

<sup>17</sup> The coefficient for Sweden is significant at the 2% level.

## References

Ai C., Norton E. C. (2003), « Interaction terms in logit and probit models », *Economics Letters* 80, 123-129

Ai C., Norton E. C., Wang H. (2004), “Computing interaction effects and standard errors in logit and probit models”, *The Stata Journal*, 4, Number 2, pp.154-167

Amable B. (2005) *Les cinq capitalismes. Diversité des systèmes économiques et sociaux dans la mondialisation*. Seuil, Paris.

Angrist J. D., Evans W. N. (1998), “Children and Their Parents' Labor Supply: Evidence from Exogenous Variation in Family Size”, *The American Economic Review*, Vol. 88, No. 3., June, pp. 450-477

Anxo D., Erhel C., Schippers J. (Dirs) (2008), *Transitions and Time Adjustments over the Life Course*, Dutch University Press, 272 p, feb. 2008.

Anxo D., Fagan C., Cebrian I., Moreno G. (2007), “Patterns of Labour Market Integration in Europe: a Life Course Perspective on Time Policies”, *Socio-Economic Review*, Vol. 5 no 2, Oxford University Press, 2007

Begg I., Erhel C., Mortensen J. (dirs, 2010), *Medium term employment challenges of the Lisbon strategy*, № DG EMPL VT/2008/010, CEPS, Bruxelles.

<http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=101&langId=en>

Bothfeld, S., O'Reilly, J. (2002), “What happens after working part time? Integration, maintenance or exclusionary transitions in Britain and western Germany” *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, Vol. 26, 409-439.

Brown J. G., Snower D. J. (2009), “Incentives and Complementarities of Flexicurity”, *IFW Working Paper* No. 1526| June 2009

Chaupain-Guillot S., Guillot O., Jankeliowitch-Laval E. « Choix d'activité des mères et garde des jeunes enfants : une comparaison entre les pays de l'Europe des Quinze à partir des données de l'ECHP » *Document de Travail du BETA* n° 2008 – 3, Février 2008

Davis S., Faberman R., Haltiwanger J. (2006), “The flow approach to labor markets: New data sources and micro-macro links”, *The Journal of Economic Perspectives*, vol 20, n°3, pp 3-23.

Davoine L., Erhel C., Guergoat-Larivière M. (2008), “Monitoring Employment Quality in Europe: European Employment Strategy Indicators and Beyond”, *International Labour Review*, september 2008, N. 147 (2-3), pp.163-198

De Henau J., Meulders D., O'Dorchai, S. (2010) “Maybe Baby: Comparing Partnered Women's Employment and Child Policies in the EU-15”, *Feminist Economics*, 16: 1, 43 — 77

Dex S., Gustafsson S., Vlasblom J.D., Wetzels C. (1996), "Women's labor force transitions in connection with childbirth: A panel data comparison between Germany, Sweden and Great Britain", *Journal of Population Economics*, Vol.9, No.3, 223-246

Erhel C., Guergoat-Larivière M. (2009), « Dynamique de la qualité de l'emploi en Europe: qualité et hétérogénéité des trajectoires », *Relief 29, Echanges du Céreq*, décembre 2009, pp.213-226

European Commission (2009), *Employment in Europe 2009*, chapter 2.

European Expert Group on Flexicurity (2007), *Flexicurity Pathways - Turning hurdles into stepping stones*, Report to the European Commission, Brussels.

Eurostat (2008), *EU-SILC user database description*, version 2006-1 from 01-03-08.

Jaumotte F. (2003), "Labour force participation of women: empirical evidence on the role of policy and other determinants in OECD countries", *OECD Economic Studies*, No. 37, 2003/2

Kalmijn, M., Muffels, R., Uunk, W. (2005), "The Impact of Young Children on Women's Labour Supply: A Reassessment of Institutional Effects in Europe" *Acta Sociologica*, 48(1), 41-62.

Kenjoh E. (2005) "New Mothers' Employment and Public Policy in the UK, Germany, the Netherlands, Sweden, and Japan", *Labour* 19 (Special Issue) 5-49

Mortensen D., Pissarides C. (1994), "Job creation and job destruction in the theory of unemployment", *The Review of Economic Studies*, vol 61, n°3, pp 397-415.

Moschion J. (2007), "Reconciling Work and Family Life : The Effect of French Family Policies", Document de travail CES 2007.73.

Muffels, R. (dir) (2008), *Flexibility and employment security in Europe: labour markets in transition*, Edward Elgar Publishing

OECD (2006), *Employment Outlook*, chapter 5.

OECD (2009a), *Employment Outlook*, chapter 2.

OECD (2009b), *OECD Family database, Key characteristics of parental leave systems*, Social Policy division.

Pailhe A., Meurs D., Ponthieux S. (2008), "How much does it cost to stay at home? Career interruptions and the gender wage gap in France", *Document de travail INSEE* N°F0802

Pissarides C. (1991), *Equilibrium Unemployment Theory*, Basic Blackwell, Oxford.

Schmid G., Gazier B. (dir) 2002, *The Dynamics of Full Employment. Social Integration through Transitional Labour Markets*, Edward Elgar

Sigle-Rushton, W., & Waldfogel, J. (2007). Motherhood and women's earnings in Anglo-American, Continental European, and Nordic Countries. *Feminist Economics*, 13(2), 55-91.

## Appendix

### Appendix 1 – Variables description

#### - **Transition variable<sup>18</sup> (used in section 4.1):**

The transition variable between employment and non-employment is constructed using the respondent's activity status (RB210) and his most recent status change over the last twelve months (PL180). This last variable can take 12 values that are all possible transitions between employment, unemployment, retirement and other inactivity. From these two available variables, the transition variable used in this paper is constructed by distinguishing four possible transitions: from employment to employment, from employment to non-employment, from non-employment to employment and from non-employment to non-employment.

#### - **Activity status variable (used in section 4.2):**

In the section 4.2 we use the EU-SILC variable PL030 to distinguish between part-time and full-time work. This variable includes 9 categories and gives details on reasons for inactivity: we have gathered together seven of them to get the “non-employment” category. Distinction between full-time work and part-time relies on respondent's appreciation.

#### - **Independent variables :**

##### ○ *Individual characteristics*

We use variables on :

- Initial education level according to ISCED classification (cf. Infra ; categories 0 and 1 of the variable PE040 have been gathered)
- Sex (RB090)
- Age (based on variable RX010 and decomposed in three categories : 15-24, 25-54 and 55-64)
- Marital life (a dummy variable “Couple” is constructed gathering categories of legal union and de facto union of the variable PB200)
- Health status (based on chronic illness variable PH020)
- Nationality (PB220A) includes three possible values : « national », « citizen from another EU country » and « citizen from outside the EU »

##### ○ *Country of residence (PB020)*

##### ○ *Variables related to children and childcare*

It is possible in the cross-sectional database to match children with their parents thanks to father and mother ID variables (PB160 and PB170). We then constructed a dummy variable to identify parents of children aged three or less.

---

<sup>18</sup>For transition rates, the weight variable used is RB060.

The cross-sectional SILC database also contains some information on the use of childcare services (RL010: education at pre-school; RL030: child care at centre-based services; RL040: child care at day-care centre; RL050: child care by a professional child-minder at child's home or at child-minder's home). We have gathered these different variables in order to have a “childcare” dummy variable for children under three.

### **- ISCED classification**

This classification proposed by UNESCO (revised in 1997) includes 7 grades:

Level 0 – Pre-primary education; Level 1 – Primary education or first stage of basic education; Level 2 – Lower secondary or second stage of basic education; Level 3 – (Upper) secondary education; Level 4 – Post-secondary non-tertiary education; Level 5 – First stage of tertiary education; Level 6 – Second stage of tertiary education

### **- Countries abbreviations**

AT: Austria  
BE: Belgium  
CY: Cyprus  
CZ: Czech Republic  
DE: Germany  
DK: Denmark  
EE: Estonia  
ES: Spain  
FI: Finland  
FR: France  
GR: Greece  
HU: Hungary  
IE: Ireland  
IS: Iceland  
IT: Italy  
LT: Lithuania  
LU: Luxembourg  
LV: Latvia  
NL: Netherlands  
NO: Norway  
PL: Poland  
PT: Portugal  
SE: Sweden  
SI: Slovenia  
SK: Slovakia  
UK: United Kingdom



## Appendix 2 – Complementary results

**Table 8- Transitions from non-employment:**

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4	
Parameter	Estimate	Pr > ChiSq	Estimate	Pr > ChiSq	Estimate	Pr > ChiSq	Estimate	Pr > ChiSq
Intercept	-1.1981	<.0001	-1.2613	<.0001	-1.2675	0.0007	-1.0781	0.0041
educlevel2	-0.1997	<.0001	-0.1911	<.0001	0.0522	0.7344	0.0411	0.7883
educlevel3	0.4796	<.0001	0.4940	<.0001	0.5836	<.0001	0.5748	<.0001
educlevel4	0.8508	<.0001	0.8743	<.0001	0.7877	<.0001	0.7986	<.0001
educlevel5	1.0677	<.0001	1.0992	<.0001	1.1409	<.0001	1.1425	<.0001
woman	-0.6614	<.0001	-0.5627	<.0001	-1.9392	<.0001	-2.2152	<.0001
ag15_24	-0.6929	<.0001	-0.6857	<.0001	0.0553	0.6302	0.0597	0.6062
ag55_64	-2.0572	<.0001	-2.0424	<.0001	-2.3762	0.0026	-2.1425	0.0055
couple2_2006	0.1794	<.0001	0.1618	<.0001	0.8167	0.0176	0.8160	0.0174
illness05	-0.6755	<.0001	-0.6836	<.0001	-0.5235	<.0001	-0.5158	<.0001
eu	0.2456	0.0014	0.2467	0.0014	-0.0309	0.8883	-0.0393	0.8583
oth	0.1272	0.0176	0.1088	0.0446	-0.5679	<.0001	-0.5726	<.0001
kid3	-0.00003	0.9994	1.0458	<.0001			0.2569	0.1219
woman*kid3			-1.3754	<.0001				
childcare					1.0510	<.0001		
woman* childcare							1.0107	<.0001
Country dummies	Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes	
Number of observations	85007		85007		5173		5173	

Source : EU-SILC, 2006 cross section data base, authors' computation

**Table 9- Multinomial logit on activity choices (model [4] with dummies)**

Parameter	Employment status 2006	Estimate	Standard Error	Pr > ChiSq
Intercept	PT	-1.1520	0.1486	<.0001
Intercept	FT	0.3665	0.1135	0.0012
educlevel2	PT	0.2331	0.1256	0.0634
educlevel2	FT	0.4804	0.0851	<.0001
educlevel3	PT	0.8171	0.1112	<.0001
educlevel3	FT	1.2386	0.0764	<.0001
educlevel4	PT	1.0761	0.1438	<.0001
educlevel4	FT	1.4721	0.1079	<.0001
educlevel5	PT	1.2732	0.1131	<.0001
educlevel5	FT	2.0443	0.0806	<.0001
woman	PT	-0.4824	0.0886	<.0001
woman	FT	-3.5655	0.0527	<.0001
ag15_24	PT	-0.5534	0.1118	<.0001
ag15_24	FT	-0.7335	0.0759	<.0001
ag55_64	PT	-0.6798	0.5569	0.2222
ag55_64	FT	-1.6999	0.2993	<.0001

couple	PT	-0.1082	0.1801	0.5479
couple	FT	0.0539	0.1633	0.7412
illness	PT	-0.3548	0.0730	<.0001
illness	FT	-0.5925	0.0558	<.0001
eu	PT	-0.2312	0.1585	0.1448
eu	FT	-0.1611	0.1292	0.2123
oth	PT	-0.8643	0.1176	<.0001
oth	FT	-0.9412	0.0807	<.0001
woman* childcare	PT	1.2369	0.1434	<.0001
woman* childcare	FT	1.0420	0.0919	<.0001
childcare	PT	0.2361	0.1325	0.0749
childcare	FT	0.4000	0.0790	<.0001
at	PT	-0.7470	0.2197	0.0007
at	FT	0.1997	0.1933	0.3016
be	PT	0.2639	0.2154	0.2206
be	FT	1.2974	0.1984	<.0001
cy	PT	-1.0207	0.2942	0.0005
cy	FT	2.1589	0.2073	<.0001
cz	PT	-2.3108	0.2885	<.0001
cz	FT	0.1770	0.1921	0.3566
dk	PT	-0.6125	0.2733	0.0250
dk	FT	1.3823	0.2270	<.0001
ee	PT	-1.9280	0.2957	<.0001
ee	FT	0.8092	0.1959	<.0001
es	PT	-0.6390	0.2032	0.0017
es	FT	1.2628	0.1800	<.0001
fi	PT	-1.6492	0.2595	<.0001
fi	FT	0.5677	0.1962	0.0038
fr	PT	-0.0664	0.1987	0.7384
fr	FT	1.0914	0.1820	<.0001
gr	PT	-0.6435	0.2365	0.0065
gr	FT	1.5397	0.1943	<.0001
hu	PT	-2.7888	0.3013	<.0001
hu	FT	-0.0996	0.1871	0.5944
ie	PT	-0.2924	0.2190	0.1819
ie	FT	0.7787	0.1969	<.0001
it	PT	-0.2528	0.1928	0.1898
it	FT	1.3041	0.1756	<.0001
lt	PT	-2.1585	0.4598	<.0001
lt	FT	1.5141	0.2231	<.0001
lu	PT	0.2542	0.1711	0.1374
lu	FT	1.5574	0.1525	<.0001
lv	PT	-1.4240	0.3116	<.0001
lv	FT	1.1587	0.2121	<.0001
nl	PT	1.6391	0.2237	<.0001

nl	FT	0.8719	0.2220	<.0001
no	PT	0.2838	0.2571	0.2697
no	FT	2.1216	0.2255	<.0001
pl	PT	-1.1300	0.2081	<.0001
pl	FT	1.1869	0.1777	<.0001
pt	PT	-0.3711	0.3172	0.2420
pt	FT	3.0314	0.2263	<.0001
se	PT	0.5491	0.2332	0.0185
se	FT	1.4971	0.2173	<.0001
si	PT	-1.2052	0.3643	0.0009
si	FT	2.4235	0.2248	<.0001
sk	PT	-1.7320	0.3328	<.0001
sk	FT	1.8407	0.1999	<.0001
uk	PT	0.0595	0.1985	0.7644
uk	FT	0.4545	0.1857	0.0144
is	PT	-0.2505	0.2793	0.3698
is	FT	1.4229	0.2390	<.0001
Observations	25615			

Source : EU-SILC, 2006 cross section data base, authors' computation